

REMARKS

Claims 2, 5 and 14 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 8 and 17 were previously cancelled. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-13, 15, 16, and 18 are currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 13 and 15 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority.

Applicant notes that a statement of the relevance of the reference cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed August 18, 2000 was included in the Specification at page 4. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge review and consideration of the reference in the next Office correspondence.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Uz, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,682,204 in view of Hatano, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,091,460. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 12 require that the interval varies inversely with the determined magnitude of motion and the determined time-varying rate of change of

said magnitude. Further, independent claim 4 requires that the interval varies inversely with the calculated mean value and the calculated time-varying rate of change of said mean value. Moreover, independent claims 1, 4 and 12 require that reordering is performed on input frames following the intra-frame coded picture.

The present invention relates to the reordering of input frames following the intra-frame coded picture according to the intervals between successive frames of predictive coded pictures. Thus, according to an aspect of Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 4 and 12, reordering is performed on input frames following the intra-frame coded picture (or the first occurrence of each GOP) according to the determined interval of successive frames of the predictive coded picture. Accordingly, P pictures (predictive coded pictures) and/or B pictures (bi-directionally predictive coded pictures) can be reordered in a GOP, following a scene change.

Uz discusses detection of a scene change, which is not relevant to the present invention. Uz describes that when a scene change is detected a new GOP (group of pictures) is started (Uz, column 11, lines 34-36). Namely, an intra-frame coded picture (I) is selected at the beginning of the new GOP. Uz makes use of the term "motion estimation score" to represent a difference in video signal between estimated motion image and a reference image. Therefore, "score" does not represent the magnitude of motion, which corresponds to the motion vector.

Uz does not disclose or suggest the above-referenced features of independent claims 1, 4 and 12. Accordingly, Uz and Hatano, even if taken together as a whole in combination, do not disclose or suggest the recitations of Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1, 4 and 12.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from independent claim 4, and claim 13 depends from independent claim 12. Therefore, claims 10, 11 and 12 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Uz and Hatano, et al., in view of Sugano et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,459. This rejection is traversed.

Hatano does not remedy the deficiencies of Uz as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claim 12. Therefore, claim 16, which depends from independent claim 12 and thus incorporates novel and nonobvious features thereof is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have

any questions regarding the Amendment or the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "George Brieger".

George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:eg